

HAMILTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
AUGUST 11, 2003

The Hamilton County Board of Commissioners met on Monday, August 11, 2003 in the Commissioner's Courtroom in the Hamilton County Government and Judicial Center, One Hamilton County Square, Noblesville, Indiana. The Commissioners met in Executive Session at 1:35 pm in Conference Room 1A. President Holt called the public meeting to order at 1:45 pm and declared a quorum present of Commissioner Christine Altman, Commissioner Steven C. Dillinger and Commissioner Steven A. Holt. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Approval of Minutes: [1:51:26]

Altman motioned to approve the July 28, 2003 minutes. Dillinger seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Executive Session Memorandum:

Dillinger motioned to approve the August 11, 2003 Executive Session Memorandum. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Highway Business [1:51:53]

Acceptance of Bonds/Letters of Credit - Highway Department:

Mr. Jim Neal requested acceptance of Bonds and Letters of Credit for the Highway Department. 1) HCHD #B-92-0032 - Safeco Insurance Company Permit Bond No. 5666311 issued on behalf of United Telephone Company of Indiana, Inc. in the sum of \$25,000 for any work performed within the right-of-ways of Hamilton County. Bond expires July 2, 2004. 2) HCHD #B-95-0074 - Continental Casualty Company Continuation Certificate of Bond No. 137872093 issued on behalf of Doris Cullison dba Cullison Excavating in the sum of \$25,000 to now expire July 31, 2004. 3) HCHD #B-01-0094 - Ohio Farmers Insurance Company Continuation Certificate for Bond No. 5785699 issued on behalf of Excavating Plus, Inc. Db a R & R Excavating in the sum of \$25,000 to now expire June 28, 2004. 4) HCHD #B-03-0082 - Western Surety Company Permit Bond No. 14509296 issued on behalf of Valenti-Held Contractor/Developer, Inc. in the sum of \$5,000 for temporary construction drive at Avalon, to expire July 24, 2004. 5) HCHD #B-03-0083 - Liberty Mutual Insurance Company Performance Bond No. 354-017-269 issued on behalf of Duncan Robertson, Inc. in the sum of \$338,357.20 for Bridge #198, 191st Street over cool Creek to expire July 17, 2005. 6) HCHD #B03-0084 - Liberty Mutual Insurance Company Payment Bond No. 354-017-269 issued on behalf of Duncan Robertson, Inc. in the sum of \$338,357.20 for Bridge #198, 191st Street over Cool Creek to expire July 17, 2005. 7) HCHD #B-03-0085 - Merchants Bonding Company Permit Bond No. 6317 issued on behalf of Metro Plastics Technologies, Inc. in the sum of \$5,000 for a tap pit including a directly associated push or bore at 9155 E. 146th Street, 146th Street and Herriman Boulevard to expire July 31, 2004. 8) HCHD #B-03-0086 - Merchants Bonding Company Permit Bond No. IN6961 issued on behalf of The River Group, Inc. in the sum of \$5,000 to expire July 30, 2004. 9) HCHD #B-03-0087 - Old Republic Surety Company Permit Bond No. 1203183 issued on behalf of Fbi Buildings, Inc. in the sum of \$10,000 for 2nd drive to accommodate larger parking lot at Harbour Shores Baptist Church, 8011 East 216th Street, Cicero, to expire

July 28, 2004. 10) HCHD #B-03-0088 - RLI Insurance Company Permit Bond No. 717855 issued on behalf of Tom Spiker Excavating in the sum of \$5,000 for a sewer line, to expire July 15, 2004. 11) HCHD #B-03-0089 - RLI Insurance Company in the sum of \$5,000 for a street bore, to expire July 15, 2004. 12) HCHD #B-03-0090 - Gulf Insurance Company Subdivision Bond No. B21879845 issued on behalf of Northside Investments LLC in the sum of \$157,890 for Long Branch Estates, Section 3 - conspan bridge structure, footings and erection (HCHD Bridge No. 206) to expire August 4, 2005. Dillinger motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Agreements [1:52:40]

Field Drive Bridge - Release of Escrow:

Mr. Neal requested the Release of Escrow Agreement, HCHD #M-01-0071, between Hamilton County and Atlas Excavating for the Field Drive Bridge. Dillinger motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Bridge #82 Utility Agreement:

Mr. Neal requested approval of a non-reimbursable Utility Agreement, HCHD #M-03-0031, between Hamilton County and Verizon for Bridge No. 82, Crooked Creek Avenue over Cicero Creek. Dillinger motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Bridge #206 Inspection Agreement:

Mr. Neal requested approval of Inspection Agreement, HCHD #A-03-0016, between Northside Investments LLC, USI Consultants, Inc. and Hamilton County in the amount of \$8,700.00 for Bridge #206, Auburn Creek Crossing over Long Branch Creek. Dillinger motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Bridge #262 Construction Inspection Agreement:

Mr. Neal requested approval of Construction Inspection Agreement, HCHD #E-03-0011, for Bridge #262, carrying Fall Creek Road over Geist Reservoir between Hamilton County and United Consulting Engineers and Architects in an amount not to exceed \$638,000. Dillinger motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Rangeline Road Ramp Supplement No. 1:

Mr. Neal requested approval of Supplemental Agreement No. 1, HCHD #E-02-0014, for construction of Rangeline Road ramp from 146th Street to US 31. The agreement is between American Consulting, Inc. and Hamilton County in a new not to exceed contract total of \$488,186.75. The supplement is in the amount of \$288,106.75. Dillinger motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Official Action [1:55:16]

96th Street & Olio Road:

Mr. Neal requested approval of an official action rescinding the four-way stop at 96th

Street and Olio Road to install a traffic signal. Dillinger motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Correspondence [1:55:37]

Bridge #262 Letters to INDOT:

Mr. Neal requested approval of a letter to INDOT regarding Bridge #262, Fall Creek Road over Geist Reservoir construction inspection. The letter states that we do not have personnel in-house to do the construction inspection. We requested RFP's and have selected United Consulting Engineers & Architects as our representative. Dillinger motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Neal requested approval of a letter to INDOT designating Mr. Tim Bussell, employee of United Consulting Engineers & Architects as the full-time Resident Representative for the construction of Bridge #262. Dillinger motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Ditch Road Intersection Bids: [1:56:39]

Mr. Neal stated bids were opened at the July 28th meeting regarding the Ditch Road intersection improvements at 96th Street & 116th Street. It came to our attention following the last meeting that there was an error in the apparent low bid from E&B Paving, who had been awarded the project. The highway department is recommending the bid award be rescinded and all bids rejected. When the bids were adjusted for the proper unit price, all the bids came in 15% over the engineer's estimate. The highway department would like to re-advertise the project at a later date. Altman motioned to rescind based upon the error of the bid. Dillinger seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Bridge #129 Final Audit: [1:58:01]

Mr. Neal requested approval of a letter to INDOT regarding the final audit for Bridge #129, Prairie Baptist Road over William Lock Ditch. The letter states the audit has been completed and the State owes Hamilton County \$8,722.25. Altman motioned to approve. Dillinger seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Request to Advertise [1:58:25]

Resurface Contract 03-4, Various Road in Clay Township:

Mr. Neal requested permission to advertise for Resurface Contract 03-4, Various roads in Clay Township, with the bid opening scheduled for September 8, 2003. Dillinger motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Altman asked if that is enough time to get it done before year end? Mr. Neal stated yes. Motion carried unanimously.

Resurface Contract 03-5, Various Roads in Clay and Washington Townships:

Mr. Neal requested permission to advertise for Resurface Contract 03-5, Various roads in Clay and Washington Townships with the bid opening scheduled for September 8, 2003. Altman motioned to approve. Dillinger seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

116th Street Closing: [1:59:47]

Altman stated she has asked the highway department to talk with the City of Carmel asking them if they will be closing 116th Street between Rangeline Road and College Avenue next year. We need to coordinate our projects if that is the case.

Bid Openings [2:00:32]**Sign Truck - Highway Department:**

Mr. Howard opened the bids for the Single Axle Sign Truck for the Highway Department. Form 96, Non-Collusion Affidavit, and Bid Bond were included unless otherwise specified. 1) W. Hare & Son - \$140,322.85. 2) Circle City GMC - \$143,775.00. Mr. Howard recommended the bids be forwarded to the Highway Department for review and recommendation at the next meeting. Dillinger motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

4-H Storage Barn Rental:

Mr. Howard opened the only bid received for rental of the 4-H Storage Barns from Superior Dock Company dba Abaco Dock in the amount of \$6,500.00 for the period of October 1, 2003 thru May 1, 2004. Included in the bid is the official check in the amount of \$500.00 as required per the bid specifications. Mr. Howard recommended the bid be forwarded to 4-H for review. Dillinger motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Altman stated we need to forward to 4-H the memorandum we received from Mr. Ward, regarding clauses in the contract. Motion carried unanimously.

Plat Approvals [2:04:23]**Cumberland Estate:****Centennial Townhomes Buildings 23 & 24:**

Mr. Tim Knapp recommended approval of plats for Cumberland Estate and Centennial Townhomes Buildings 23 & 24. Dillinger motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Bridge #262 Funding Update: [2:06:17]

Mr. Matt Knight updated the Commissioners on the funding for Bridge #262, Fall Creek Road over Geist Reservoir. Mr. Knight stated the local portion funding required is \$3.6 million up front, this includes all construction and construction inspection costs. The county will be reimbursed \$2.9 million from federal funding. This will be received somewhere in the middle of 2004, assuming the federal highway bill is passed. We found available money in the Major Bridge fund. We have \$1.3 million appropriated out of Cum Bridge for this project. If we use \$2 million out of Major Bridge and \$380,000 left over from bond funds that need to be spent on a major bridge project, the total of these will cover the funding we need, based on our estimated costs. We feel comfortable with this scenario without having to look at other funding sources. The Major Bridge funds will be tied up until the middle of 2004 but we do not have any projects scheduled during that time. Altman asked if this re-arranges projects or is this a different

scenario that you gave us on Cum Bridge? Mr. Knight stated no, it will not affect any Cum Bridge projects, it is already in a line item designated for this project. Altman asked if we abandoned the concept of tying up Cum Bridge as a stop-gap? Mr. Knight stated yes. Mr. Davis stated Mr. Howard has reviewed this and agrees that Major Bridge monies can be used for this purposes. Mr. Knight stated if the Board concurs with this direction they will continue to pursue a interlocal agreement with INDOT with this funding scenario. Mr. Davis stated the additional appropriation request is on the September County Council agenda. Consensus of the Board was to proceed.

Sheriff: [2:11:19]

Belmont Circle Traffic Study:

Sheriff Doug Carter stated the Commissioners requested a traffic study on Belmont Circle in the Lexington Farms Subdivision in southern Clay Township. Sheriff Carter presented the results of the study. Sheriff Carter will be attending the homeowners association meeting on August 12 to assist them with implementing a neighborhood crime watch program and he will share the results of this traffic study at that time. Altman stated you have concluded there is not a speed problem at this location? Sheriff Carter stated yes. Holt asked for a request of the highway department to install a speed limit sign for the southbound traffic. Dillinger so moved. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Westfield Public Safety: [2:13:17]

Sheriff Carter stated Westfield Public Safety has pulled the communications switch from the Sheriff's Department to Noblesville Police Department. Sheriff Carter stated he opposes that transition and has informed Westfield of his opposition. The contract is signed and done but he felt there were significant issues that needed to be addressed in regards to the safety of firefighters, policeman and citizens in that area. We ultimately will loose the link between Westfield and our dispatch center. Altman asked if he has been able to trace the presumed \$75,000 billing? Sheriff Carter stated he has no idea, he would suspect it is an amount that will take them up to current maintenance levels of the existing Cisco software and the upgrade and maintenance fee for in-car computers. Altman asked if that would have been generated by the County? Sheriff Carter stated no. Altman asked how do they link if they convert to the other system? Sheriff Carter stated they will not be able to link at all and that is what is very disturbing. Holt asked if they link to the State Police? Sheriff Carter stated theoretically they could, but it would require more operatibility, structures to be built into this and that is not currently in the existing contract. Holt asked if we link with them? Sheriff Carter stated currently we can link with them, we don't regularly but in the event of a major incident we could. A State police officer assigned to Hamilton County has the communications capability to hear a call for assistance, if a Westfield officer would need assistance the Sheriff's office will probably not hear the request. Holt asked how would he hear the request? Sheriff Carter stated if he happened to be monitoring the Noblesville dispatch center. Holt asked if he would need 2 radios or does it flip back and forth? Sheriff Carter stated flip back and forth from one center to another. Currently we can do that with Carmel. Holt asked if that is manual or does it pick up the next transmission. Sheriff Carter stated it would require a manual process. Holt asked if the State trooper would have to manually flip to hear if a Sheriff's deputy is having a problem? Sheriff Carter stated no, he will probably keep the volume turned up and monitor what is happening. Holt asked if a

Westfield officer is having a problem on US 31 he would be oblivious? Sheriff Carter stated probably. Holt stated or he would need three radios at the same time? Sheriff Carter stated yes, with the amount of traffic it would be virtually impossible to monitor three radios at the same time. Altman stated we have talked at the EMA meeting when discussing how to use the grant monies about the E-911 system, will that help the situation with the radio software? Sheriff Carter stated yes, it will depend what is chosen. He does not think the decision should be his, Fishers, Carmel, Noblesville, Westfield should have a say. Once the infrastructure is in place he does not think they will scrap it all and start over. The software is available for us to create operability. The question is do we want to link with the City of Noblesville and Marion County to be able to get that kind of information. Holt asked if there was a high speed chase on US 31 and they were in pursuit can they flip the switch to the Sheriff? Sheriff Carter stated yes. Sheriff stated the issue would be protocol. Holt asked if the officer in the car flip it over or would Noblesville dispatch? Sheriff Carter stated it would be the officer in the car. Holt stated but you would not have the history of what is going on. Sheriff Carter stated yes, that is the driving force behind this. 95% of the time it will not be a problem, but it is the 5% of the time that they need emergent help and they don't have time to explain why. The dispatchers are overwhelmed as it is and they do a wonderful job, but this will add another step for them.

Attorney [2:22:17]

Clay Terrace Bonds:

Mr. Howard presented documents for approval and signing regarding the Clay Terrace Bonds. Mr. Howard requested acceptance of the Taxpayer Agreement and Consent to Real Property Tax Lien. Dillinger motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously. Mr. Howard requested approval and signature on the Purchase and Sale Agreement. Dillinger motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously. Mr. Howard requested approval and signature on the License Agreement. Altman motioned to approve. Dillinger seconded. Motion carried unanimously. Mr. Howard requested approval and signature of the Assignment of Interested Parties. Dillinger motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Altman asked what is the construction time frame? Mr. Howard stated August 1, 2004.

Garage Constructed in Right of Way - Millersburg Road: [2:30:39]

Mr. Chuck Kiphart stated Patricia Griffin, 28679 Millersburg Road, had constructed a garage onto an existing small building that houses their well and pump. They did not get a building permit and we were not aware of the construction. It is in the jurisdiction of Cicero and Jackson Township. We found the violation in front yard setback, it encroached in road right-of-way and also encroached in the drainage easement. It went to the Cicero/Jackson Township Board of Zoning Appeals and the homeowners requested approval to keep the building where it was. They applied for a variance to reduce the front yard setback to zero (0) to the right-of-way line. The Cicero/Jackson Township BZA approved that request conditional on the County Commissioners approving the encroachment within the drainage easement and Millersburg Road right of way. That encroachment is approximately 3' to 3'6". Dillinger motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Altman asked Mr. Griffin if he understands that if it should ever be needed for right of way purposes that we will not compensate you for the building? Mr. Griffin stated he

understands that. Motion carried unanimously.

Resolution 8-11-03-1, Creating Superior Court No. 6: [2:33:30]

Ms. Polly Pearce requested approval of Resolution 8-11-03-1, Creating Superior Court 6. This resolution states the judge would stand election in 2006 and take office in 2007. According to the State Supreme Court formula Hamilton County needs 10.94 judicial officers and we have 8.3. This is the same request as last year, which went to the study commission but never came out for approval. Dillinger motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Ordinance 7-28-03-B, Filson Earthworks:

Mr. Chuck Kiphart stated at the last meeting the Commissioners approved Ordinance 7-28-03-B As Amended, Amending the Planned Development Section of the Hamilton County Zoning Ordinance for Filson Earthworks. There was an error in the ordinance, it had the wrong zoning district. Gordon Byers has corrected the ordinance and has requested approval of the amendment to the ordinance. Dillinger motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Administrative Assistant [2:37:54]

Clay Regional Waste District Wage Board Appointment:

Mr. Swift stated the Clay Regional Waste District has requested an appointment to their Wage Board. They recommend Bob Book. Dillinger motioned to appoint Bob Book. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Holt called a break. [2:38:13]

Holt called the meeting back to order. [3:01:17]

256th Street Small Structure:

Mr. Kent Ward stated there is a situation on 256th Street west of Cal Carson Road where the Devaney Drain crosses 256th Street at the Robbins property. Recently the highway department put down new pavement, we have had problems there before where the water had to break over the road. We feel this will be impeded because in some places there are 18" of asphalt and in other places up to 6" which may compound the problem that Mr. Robbins faces with the flooding situation. Mr. Ward asked if the highway department would include the structure on the Devaney Ditch on 256th Street on their small structure inventory and bump it up a little bit. When we dredge Devaney Drain we will need a new structure and the structure is one of the problems. Holt asked Mr. Ward to share the pictures with Mr. Neal and Mr. Davis and they can report back to us at the next meeting. Holt stated effectively the new road is creating a damning effect. Mr. Davis asked if the water flowed over the road before? Holt stated yes.

Goode & Associates Amendment #2: [3:03:39]

Mr. Howard requested approval of Amendment #2 to the contractual agreement between Hamilton County and Goode & Associates, Inc. regarding the Rule 13 compliance. This is on an as needed consulting service basis under the hourly rates included in their original agreement. It

is not to exceed \$70,500. Mr. Ward stated there is enough money for this contract. It is only if we need the services as we are doing our NOY to the State for Stormwater Phase II. Dillinger motioned to approve. Holt seconded. Dillinger and Holt approved. Altman abstained. Motion carries.

Stormwater Mapping Contract:

Mr. Ward stated the Stormwater Mapping contract that was approved at the last meeting states that two of Goode's employees will be on site for six months and he would request they be allowed to use the northeast room of the Commissioner's Courtroom. Altman motioned to approve. Dillinger seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Renaming of Terry Airport: [3:06:56]

Mr. Larry Jacobi, President of Hamilton County Board of Aviation Commissioners, stated he would like to discuss the renaming of Terry Airport. Mr. Jacobi thanked the Commissioners for their support and guidance for the acquisition of Terry Airport. We did close on Terry Airport July 15, 2003. We expect our first \$300,000 check from the FAA in the next 60-90 days which will go towards paying the purchase loan. The Aviation Commissioners see many advantages and benefits from this purchase, from economic development to the fact that it will remain an airport. The benefits to Hamilton County, Boone County is manifold and we must make sure we keep that an airport and with Hamilton County owning it, that will take place. We have discussed the name of Terry Airport and would like to have a decision made at the July 28th meeting. The history behind it's current name is that a person by the name of Terry was the son of the person who developed the airport. Ray VanSickle, the past owner, saw advantages of using the word Indianapolis as the first word in the name, which he had the airport name changed to Indianapolis Terry Airport. Pilots will look at directories, approach plates, navigation maps and they search under city names, they will not look under Westfield or Zionsville if they are coming to the Indianapolis area they will look under Indianapolis. We feel it is important for the development of the airport to keep the first word Indianapolis. We have discussed other names such as Indianapolis Executive Airport, Indianapolis Regional Airport. Regional implies some airline service, which we do not have and we don't feel we want to go regional. Executive implies corporate and that word is an important word. If pilots or owners of jet aircraft are coming into the Indianapolis and they are not going to go into the big airport they are going to see Mount Comfort, Metropolitan, Greenwood and Indianapolis Terry at this point or Indianapolis Executive, which is the way we want to look at it. The County Council would like the words Hamilton County included. We have discussed Hamilton County Executive Airport, but leaving Indianapolis is needed. One of the Council suggestions was Indianapolis/Hamilton County Executive Airport. Dillinger stated he absolutely believes Hamilton County should be in the name and probably Hamilton County/Indianapolis. Mr. Jacobi distributed samples of what the pilots see. Dillinger stated the premise of creating the Commission and buying the airport, rather than taking the offer of the Indianapolis Airport Authority, was to maintain our own identity and our own designation. Dillinger stated he does not know how big a deal it is for a pilot to see it is an Indianapolis airport as much as the commercial environment we are hoping to stimulate around it. Mr. Jacobi stated the only disadvantage to leaving Indianapolis off is what the pilots look up when coming into this area. The little airplane pilots will look at a chart and will decide where they want to go and go to that place. The corporate jet pilots don't look at a map first, they look at approach plates first and that is the advantage of having Indianapolis in

the name. Dillinger asked what advantage is it to have those people land there? Mr. Howard stated .19¢ a gallon. Holt stated North Meridian hotels want to bring them in to the north side. Mr. Jacobi stated 19¢ a gallon comes to Hamilton County for each gallon sold, corporate jets will pump 400 to 2,000 gallons of gas. Holt stated he thinks they are on the right track to think of the marketing and promotion of the airport, we want it to be all it can be for the benefit of Hamilton County and the Hamilton County taxpayers. If you think it has broader appeal with that name, we can certainly have Hamilton County signs all over the place once they get on the ground. If Indianapolis Executive sells that for the landing spot, hurray and he will back them on that. Dillinger stated without Hamilton County in there? Holt stated if you look at how it is laid out, he does not know how you would say all that. Altman stated if it supports the airport the name is not material. She would like to see it known locally as Executive Airport. From a marketing standpoint if it does draw planes in to our location and supports our acquisition she would concur with you. It would not be her first choice, but we have a business to run. Mr. Howard asked if it is legally significant what is on the plates verses what the sign says? Mr. Jacobi stated no, it is not. If we want the official name to be Indianapolis/Hamilton County Executive Airport, they will abbreviate the plates any way they want to. Mr. Howard stated on the sign out front it could be Hamilton County Executive Airport? Mr. Jacobi stated the only thing is the people coming to the airport, Holt and Altman stated they did not want to do that. Mr. Jacobi stated if you want to be known as Executive Airport, that is the part that is major. Altman stated on the ground sign we could have Indianapolis Executive Owned and Operated by Hamilton County. Mr. Jacobi stated with the formal name being Indianapolis/Hamilton County Executive Airport. Holt and Altman stated that is too much. Dillinger stated he does not think it is too much, it is imperative Hamilton County be in there and it is offensive if it is not. Mr. Jacobi stated they will take it under advisement. Mr. Jacobi stated October 11 there will be a grand opening and the Commissioners will receive invitations. We are hoping to get the signage done and unveil it at that time.

Community Development Block Grants: [3:18:03]

Mr. Fritz Poffenberger, Director of Community Planning and Development for US Department of Housing and Urban Development, stated major changes have occurred in the census information and one of the major things was that in Indiana we will have the opportunity to have four (4) more Formula or Entitlement Grantees under the Community Development Block Grant Program. This means money could become available to Hamilton County if you qualify as an urban county. If we were using our appropriation today and you were a grantee today Hamilton County would be potentially eligible for \$850,000.00. The Block Grant Program is a formula program, money is determined by statute and does not require a match. It is a program that specifically gives priority to activities that benefit low and moderate income persons in the jurisdiction and in Hamilton County that would be households that are below 80% of the median income. The median income for a family of four is \$51,300 in Hamilton County. During a one to three year period, 70% of those funds would have to be spent on programs and activities that benefit low to moderate income households. Activities would include housing rehabilitation; 15% of the funds can be spent for public services such as senior programs, health programs, child care programs, etc.; funds can be used for removal of architectural barriers to help the handicapped; public facility improvements if they are consistent with the consolidated plan and the needs of low and moderate income county residents. To receive funding under this program two things must occur - the county would have to meet the test to be eligible for an

urban county and prepare a consolidated plan. That plan is a strategy to determine the needs of low and moderate income persons throughout the county. It takes a considerable amount of citizen input. Strategies have to be developed to meet those needs and prepare an annual action plan which would identify the activities that you would intend to use to meet the needs of a low or moderate income persons. Up to 20% of the annual grant can be used for planning and administrative purposes. In order to become an urban county, our attorneys have determined that the county has the essential powers to implement community development and affordable housing programs county wide. You can operate programs throughout the county and all incorporated areas. That is being reviewed by our attorneys in Washington and the reason that is important is that if we get their agreement in order to become eligible you would have to notify the incorporated areas of your interest in doing this and they would have the right to be excluded from the urban county designation if they so choose. If our attorneys rule that you do not have the essential powers to do all the community development activities county wide, the Commissioners would have to get a positive cooperative agreement from the different municipalities to join in the urban county. The reason that is important is that we have to have an urban county boundary with a population of at least 100,000 persons and that the territory in that boundary must include over half of low and moderate income persons in the county, 50% +1. We expect to have that determination by the end of the week. The reason for having the municipalities involved is that the more population that we get inside the boundaries of the urban county the more county that is in the grant. The planning number of \$850,000 assumes that the entire county is included. Any community that would drop out would lower that amount. The next steps to move forward are - he needs to secure the ruling from Washington; we need to identify a lead person within the county; the county would have to formally request to become an urban county and provide documentation of it's negotiations with the other municipalities. Our deadline is short, the 2002 population estimates were just made available and our federal fiscal year starts October 1st. In order for the county to be eligible for funding in the federal fiscal year 2004, the department has to have your agreement and we have to formally designate Hamilton County as an urban county. The deadline is the second week of September. Altman asked Mr. Poffenberger to review the relationship between the county and municipalities. Mr. Poffenberger stated we are able to provide funding to the State of Indiana, which provides grants to non-metropolitan areas and we are able to fund metropolitan communities and fund specifically designated term which is urban county, which is a county that has over 200,000 population. The connection between Hamilton County and the incorporated areas within Hamilton County has to do with meeting the threshold in our regulation for urban county. We meet one of them which is the county has a population of over 200,000, but if not every part of the county, all the incorporated and unincorporated areas are in the formal boundaries then you can go to the second qualification, which is a population included in the boundaries of the county that is over 100,000 and that the area that includes that also includes over half of the low and moderate income persons in the county. Rough calculations are that the unincorporated areas in Hamilton County, approximately 30% of the low and moderate income citizens live in unincorporated areas. We would need some of the cities and towns to be included to meet the qualification for urban counties. If the City of Noblesville were to join with the county, those population thresholds would be met. Everything after that would increase the grant amount. Altman asked if when we combine county and city is it a jointly administered program between the city and the county, is there a lead agency at the local level to coordinate? Mr. Poffenberger stated the county is the grantee. Currently our attorneys have determined that you would have the ability to do

housing, economic development and public services. Under state law you could not do anything in the area of infrastructure without the city's cooperation.

Mr. Rick Conner, Chairman of the Noblesville Housing Authority, reviewed facts about the Noblesville Housing Authority and stated they feel they are qualified to administer HUD monies to benefit low income families in Hamilton County. Presently we administer a HUD Section 8 Program, where we are able to help approximately 185 families in Noblesville and within a 5 mile radius around Noblesville and through a cooperative agreement that we have with the Indiana Housing Authority, throughout the entire Hamilton County. The first issue to recognize is that this is a tremendous benefit to Hamilton County, it is a benefit that we do not want to lose. The question is how best can Hamilton County administer these funds and given the short time frame how can we get it on it now? The Noblesville Housing Authority would like to offer Troy Halsell's services and our experience to help get this started so we don't lose the opportunity. We would like to discuss administering the grant for the benefit of the people in Hamilton County. The initial action steps would be to identify Troy as the point person to meet with the people from HUD and understand the procedures. Following the initial effort we would sit down and figure out how we might work together to help Hamilton County administer these funds. We have quite a bit of experience of administering HUD funds. Troy has community block grant experience and would be a good thing for Hamilton County and for the Housing Authority as well. Dillinger asked how much involvement would be needed by our Auditor? Mr. Conner stated initially he sees no involvement by the Auditor, initially we would need a list of all the incorporated areas in order to get the letter out and Troy would have to work with the Community Block Grant people to get the wording of the letter. Mr. Howard asked if the county is the lead agency, will the county be the payor of claims or would the Noblesville Housing Authority have the ability to do that? Mr. Conner stated nobody is going to receive any money for some time, even if we make the September 15th deadline. Mr. Howard stated he understands that. Mr. Poffenberger stated the county will be the grantee, the county will receive the federal funds. If the county puts the housing authority under contract to administer the funds we would have to work that out. Mr. Conner stated right now, we receive money from the federal government to help these families and we receive a certain amount every month on the assumption that we will house so many people. Troy then uses the money and writes the checks that helps all the people. He has complete records of everything, we are audited annually by an independent auditing agency. In terms of the writing checks, etc., he would recommend letting the housing authority do it. Mr. Howard asked if the housing authority is a registered 501C-3? Mr. Conner stated yes. Mr. Howard asked if that is a way it could be done? Mr. Poffenberger stated no, probably not. Under the block grant program the county is the grantee and under the Section 8 program the housing authority is the grantee. Mr. Conner stated we would have to make recommendations to the Auditor and they would cut the check? Mr. Poffenberger stated he does not know, we may not have to go as far down as cutting individual checks, we may be able to go with a monthly voucher. Altman asked if we could go under a contractual arrangement obviously it would be the least red tape with the county and probably we would see more benefits go directly to the people we want to help with these funds, this would be our preference. The other thing is there is 20% within the program to cover administrative costs, if we have to administer. Mr. Conner requested approval to begin the initial process so we don't miss the deadline. In terms of how we would administer the program can be decided at a later date. Mr. Poffenberger stated this is not a one time thing, this program will be annual. Holt stated he understood that if we passed the blessing of the Washington attorneys we could move forward as

long as we had a municipality agreed. Is it necessary to have the buy in of every municipality in the county if we meet the urban county definition? Mr. Poffenberger stated not everyone. It would mean more funding. Holt asked if they could opt out? Mr. Poffenberger stated they can decide not to participate initially, if they are in the program they are in for three years. At the end of three years they can leave the program. Holt asked if consent is required from each municipality to be in the program? Mr. Poffenberger stated yes, not every one. There are enough municipalities with low and moderate income persons, so that we hit 100,000 population and more than 50% of low and moderate income. Holt asked if that will bring everyone in if we use the entire population of the county? Mr. Poffenberger stated No, you can only use the population of the municipalities. Holt stated to get the full \$850,000 you need an opt in from everyone. Mr. Poffenberger stated his example of using Noblesville is between the number of low and moderate income people in other parts of the county and the low and moderate income people in Noblesville would get you over the threshold. Altman asked if municipalities lose any other federal benefits by participating in this program? Altman asked if there is a reason why they would want to opt out? Mr. Conner stated the only reason would their not understanding. It is not even to say you will spend the money in that municipality. The money is spent based on need and prioritization system that we develop along the line. [3:44:02] Altman motioned to authorize the Noblesville Housing Authority to act as the county's agent in exploring the possibilities of the HUD Grant and request that they come back to us within one month with a report as to status. Dillinger seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

COIT Update: [3:44:42]

Altman stated they have met with KPMG and defined the scope of our initial audit of our COIT funds. Vince Thomas is the partner in charge of the expedition. Mr. Howard stated we have requested public information documents, some have been granted and some have been denied and some have been provided on disc. The accountants will be reviewing that information and letting us know what we have, what we did not get and what we need in order to move forward. We anticipate meeting with State officials who might be more sympathetic to our position to try to get further insight on how we might proceed and how we might get data in a manageable form. We are convinced that without the tax returns that we are not going to be able to get manageable data that we can cross check and determine where the department has made the error. We have looked at enough cross references such as building permits, Cinergy, customer lists, etc. that we are convinced that from 2000 on there have been errors. We are not going to attack the forecasting side of it, we are going back and to try and determine why the collection numbers are mis-reported because the numbers in 2000 and 2001 are the number that show a small decrease in flatlining of our revenue that we know from our other objective the data can not be true. We anticipate that because of the state statute that makes that information confidential that we will have to have a court order. We are going to exhaust our administrative remedies and get any additional requests that we need within the next 30 days with the idea to have comprehensive data from the State that our accounts can work with by the end of the year.

Poor Relief Appeal - Clay Township: [3:48:24]

Ms. Shelly LeFlore, 417 Atherton Drive, Carmel, Indiana, stated she was denied Poor Relief from the Clay Township Trustee. Ms. LeFlore stated she has received assistance from the Clay Township Trustee in January 2003 with rent, part of her light and gas bills. She has been living in Carmel for two years in July and working at St. Vincent's Hospital making

approximately \$1,500-\$1,700 every two weeks. She lost her job due to medical reasons. She was receiving unemployment and assistance from her parents for her rent. She had taken a temporary job which ended in April. She went to the Trustee for assistance in July. She advised her landlord that she was going to be asking the Trustee for assistance she told her the Trustee had told her that she would not help her anymore. Ms. LeFlore did contact the Trustee's office and she was told to fill out an application and she would get an appointment. In the meantime Ms. Hagan called her and told her that she would not be assisting her again because she had assisted her in January. Ms. LeFlore then contacted the Indiana Civil Liberties Union who directed her to contact the NAACP. The NAACP asked her if she had received a denial letter from the Trustee. The NAACP instructed her to turn in her application and get the denial letter and then contact them. Ms. LeFlore stated Ms. Hagan has denied her application because she told her she had to apply for food stamps, which she did receive. Ms. LeFore stated her food stamps were cut because she did not attend an Impact Program, which she could not attend because she was working. Ms. LeFlore called her caseworker and the caseworker stated there was a misunderstanding and signed her up for the Impact Program, which she took back to the Trustee. Ms. Hagan then told her she was denied because she had told her to take everything off of her Ameritech phone bill, everything except basic service. Ms. LeFlore is not able to let her phone be disconnected because her daughter has a pacemaker which needs to be checked via the phone twice a month. Ms. Hagan told her to take everything off her phone except her voice mail so she could receive messages for jobs. Ms. LeFlore stated in the mean time Ms. Hagan was telling her landlord that she would not be able to pay her because she was going to have to pay \$800 gas bill and other utility bills. She implied to her landlord that she would pay her rent if Ms. LeFlore did everything she asked her to do. Ms. Hagan called the phone company in Ms. LeFlore's presence and they told her she would have to call AT&T to take long distance off her phone. Ms. LeFlore stated Ms. Hagan did not write that on her paper and she forget to cancel the long distance, which Ms. Hagan told her that because she did not call AT&T she was denying her application. Ms. Hagan then asked her to get a credit report because she was denied for low income housing. At that time Ms. LeFlore asked Ms. Hagan to pay her landlord and refer her to a shelter. Ms. Hagan told her no, she was going to wait to see what was going on. She asked Ms. Hagan to note on her documentation that she was not referring her to a shelter, which Ms. Hagan did. Ms. Hagan did pay her water bill, part of her light bill and nothing on her gas bill. She asked for a clothing voucher and school supplies, which she did give her school supplies but she did not say anything about the clothing or the gas bill. Ms. Hagan told her to call someone else about the clothing but she was not going to pay anything on the gas bill. Ms. Hagan told her landlord that she was not paying her rent to bail her out and asked her landlord if she had evicted Ms. LeFlore. The landlord told Ms. Hagan no, that she had told her if she evicted Ms. LeFlore she would not be able to live any place else. Ms. LeFlore stated her landlord has told her that as long as she was moved out by August 31st she would not give her an eviction notice so it would not go on her credit report.

Dillinger stated according to this report, Ms. Hagan was waiting for several things such as a credit report, wage statements. Ms. LeFlore stated she did get her credit report and wage statements from Kelly Services. Holt asked Ms. LeFlore what is her job status now? Ms. LeFlore stated she is looking for work and is asking the Trustee to refer her to a shelter, which Ms. Hagan refuses to do. Holt asked if an eviction has been filed? Ms. LeFlore stated no, her landlord has said if she moves by August 31st she will not file an eviction. Altman asked what have you done to file with the county welfare agency? The Poor Relief is that the Trustee will provide you with

temporary service until you gain employment or qualify for welfare services. Where are you with Welfare, in terms of getting services? Ms. LeFlore stated she receives food stamps, \$553 per month. They do not pay her any money because she has custody of her niece who receives \$478 per month because her mother is deceased. She has four interviews this week. The temporary service had a job for her today at 3:30 pm, but due to this hearing she was unable to start that job.

Ms. Hagan, Clay Township Trustee, stated she has denied Ms. LeFlore for non-cooperation until certain things were done and accomplished, part of her responsibility is to make sure clients are taking advantage of more permanent programs than her's. She did assist her initially in January. Since then she has helped Ms. LeFlore with her electric and water bills but has continued to deny her for the rent. She always requires her clients to apply for subsidized housing, if it looks like it will be an ongoing situation. As a condition of her assistance in January she required Ms. LeFlore to apply for Section 8 housing. When she came back in July, Ms. Hagan checked on the status of that application and found she had been denied. She had not checked to see why she had been denied. Ms. Hagan did the follow-up and it turned out she has a terrible credit rating and does not qualify for subsidized housing nor will she qualify for subsidized housing due to her credit history and she had filed for bankruptcy, which we assumed had taken care of everything, but it has not. The only way Ms. Hagan has been able to get Ms. LeFlore to take the steps to more self-sufficiency is to deny her until she takes the next step. Ms. Hagan requested the Commissioners support her in her denial so she can continue to work with her. There is not a space in a shelter to go to, so she has not given her a referral to a shelter at this point. She has talked to the Inter-Faith Hospitality Network and they think they will have an opening this week, but that is not firm. She has not generally been cooperative with anybody. Ms. Hagan stated she has recommended Ms. LeFlore go to Consumer Credit Counseling to check with them about some kind of payment plan. Her understanding from Ms. LeFlore's landlord is that her mother has paid the rent, which has been consistently late. Ms. LeFlore also has a medical problem, which she has arranged care for. Altman asked what kind of assistance has been provided to put her on permanent assistance? Ms. Hagan stated she has required her to reapply for food stamps when it turned out she did not receive the full amount which was due to her Impact sanction. Altman asked to clarify the statement that she does not qualify for Welfare assistance because she receives the survivor benefit? Ms. Hagan stated she does not qualify for Temporary Assistance to Needy Families because of the income in the household. She qualifies for the maximum amount of food stamps, the children are under Medicaid Altman asked if Ms. Hagan has provided to Ms. LeFlore written statements as to your actions within the time period, she made the allegation that she did not receive written denials? Ms. Hagan stated yes, you have copies of all of those. Dillinger asked how much is her rent? Ms. Hagan stated \$1,075 per month. Altman asked if that does not include utilities? Ms. Hagan stated correct. Holt asked Ms. Hagan to explain the denial of the shelter care? Ms. Hagan stated she has no place to send her? Ms. Hagan stated normally she would send her to Third Phase, but for a family of five that will not work. Holt asked if you had made a referral to a shelter, is your obligation to pay for it? Ms. Hagan stated no, although generally she has. Holt asked if you have ever made a referral for a family of five? Ms. Hagan stated no, a family of four, which were sent to Holy Family in Indianapolis, which were no shows. Holt asked Ms. Hagan if she has explained to Ms. LeFlore that there was no shelter space available? Ms. Hagan stated at the time when they discussed the possibility of Third Phase, she told her she did not think that was the appropriate place for her. She asked for a written denial and I gave it to her. Ms. Hagan stated the larger shelters in

Indianapolis are available to her, but they are based on availability and they are all full as of the end of last week. Ms. Hagan stated if Ms. LeFlore has a job that might change the direction they are going. She has a gas bill of \$1,000, the only bill that gets consistently paid is the phone bill, which runs \$800 per month. Discussion of the phone bill continued. [4:15:09] Altman asked what kind of plan do you have in place for a long term solution for a place to live? Ms. LeFlore stated that is why she has asked to be referred to a shelter. Altman asked if you are going to be able to work? Ms. LeFlore stated yes. Altman asked if it would satisfy your appeal if we request Ms. Hagan to refer you to the first available shelter opportunity? Ms. LeFlore stated what is she supposed to do until then? Altman asked if Ms. LeFlore has looked for other apartments to move in to if no shelter becomes available? Ms. LeFlore stated she has applied for two low income houses, but she was rejected because of her credit rating. Ms. LeFlore stated she needs Ms. Hagan to pay for her July rent and her gas bill so she could get gas when she gets another apartment. [4:18:28] Ms. Hagan stated she will make a referral as soon as the shelter is available. Dillinger asked if the rent is paid how long can she live there? Ms. Hagan stated she will be fine until the end of August, she recommended to the landlord was that once there is an eviction or a utility bill on your record that is what disqualifies you for subsidized housing. When this came to light, it was a bigger problem than normal. Ms. Hagan stated she has told her landlord that she will pay the July rent, but she did not want her landlady evicting her, assuming it would ruin her credit. Dillinger asked was that not the reason for the appeal, was the July rent? Ms. Hagan stated yes, she is going to pay that and we are going to make sure we are moving toward the shelter. Dillinger asked Ms. LeFlore if this satisfied her appeal? Ms. LeFlore stated yes. Dillinger asked you will live there until August and you will cooperate with Ms. Hagan? Ms. Hagan stated she will not be able to take care of the several thousands that are on the credit bill, she is trying to get enough slack for her to go elsewhere. Holt stated knowing that Ms. Hagan is paying your rent and refer you to a shelter are you willing to withdraw your appeal? Ms. LeFlore stated yes.

Commissioner Committee Reports [4:22:57]

EMA Agreement for Professional Services for Grant Proposal:

Mr. Hendericks presented an Agreement for Professional Services with PMSI, Inc., to serve as grand administrator, consultant and representative for the Local Emergency Planning Sub-Grant Agreement FEMA Federal Fiscal Year 2002 Supplemental Funding. This grant has \$21,200 available to Hamilton County for the hiring of someone to assist with the development of an updated emergency response plan. Portions of that have been done in-house, 50% remains to be completed. This agreement covers the completion of this part of the program. This vendor would be paid 50% of the value of the grant for approximately \$10,500. Altman stated this was discussed at the last EMA meeting and she was unaware that 50% was completed, we will have to review that. It was the consensus of the EMA Board that this was in the best interest of the county to have this particular firm complete what is indicated in the contract. [4:25:26] Altman motioned, based upon that discussion, that we approve the contract. Dillinger seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Homeland Security Programs: [4:25:41]

Mr. Hendericks updated the Commissioners on the current Homeland Security programs. Mr. Hendericks stated along with the planning program there is a program involving the development of community emergency response teams. That grant is initially funded to the tune

of \$2,798. Using 2003 Homeland Security money, one program is for \$140,000 to purchase Homeland Security Equipment. An application will have to be filed with concurrences of cities and towns with a population of 25,000 or greater and an agreement to provide the State with GIS information at no cost and the development of a budget on the items to be purchased. We are in the processing of developing a budget for that. The deadline is September 15, 2003. Part 2 of this grant is \$463,400 would be available following the same guidelines and purchasing items off of the same recommended list. It is possible we could expend all of those funds. There is a homeland security assessment process with a deadline of August 29, 2003.

Juvenile Detention Center: [4:30:37]

Dillinger stated there was a joint meeting with the County Council last week regarding the Juvenile Detention Center. The committee has worked diligently to provide information based on the Huskey study, showing the doing the nothing option would cost \$22 million more than doing the something option. Dillinger motioned to approve the committee's recommendation and forward it on the County Council for September 3rd approval for funding. Altman seconded with approaching council for an amount not to exceed \$32 million. Motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Budgets [4:32:49]

Altman asked to review the Buildings & Grounds budget and Weights & Measures budget. We also need to determine who will present them to Council. Altman would like to know why retirement and pension went from \$2.5 million to \$3.5 million. Mr. Swift stated PERF gave written notification that the employer contribution was going up from 5.5% to 6.5%, which was translated to dollars. Mr. Swift stated he believes the recommendation to raise the figures came from Mr. Reuter. Altman asked Robin to talk to her later. Holt stated we have already approved the budget. Altman stated no we have not, it went to Council but nobody has ever discussed the budget, which causes her some concern. We have several items in the budget that she presumed we would be talking about. Altman asked Mr. Warner to review the Buildings & Grounds budget. Altman stated she does not recall discussing the prioritization of the projects for the maintenance of the buildings. Mr. Warner stated he prepares the budget notes to explain what might be outside the guidelines as the Council presents that. Typically we have certain things that require excessive increases, typically in the utility area. He has described the capital outlays and summarized with totals. Altman asked Mr. Warner if he has prioritized depending on available funding? Mr. Warner stated he usually does not know what the Council is looking for until he goes to the meeting. Altman asked if we could pull out the fairgrounds and put it in to separate line items so we can see what is spent. Council spent a lot of money to study how to make the fairgrounds more cost effective. Most of that is in your budget such as the grant from HCVB for marketing and scheduling software, which makes no sense in a maintenance budget. Mr. Warner stated the Fairgrounds Buildings and Grounds Committee felt that they would have it in his budget rather than in their budget. If you would prefer to direct 4-H to put in their budget or if you feel he should delete it out of his budget, he has no problem with that. Altman stated she is suggesting isolating fairgrounds physical expenses such as electricity, maintenance, etc., in to their budget so we see what it costs to own and operate that facility and offset with rental and then we will know the bottom line. Mr. Warner stated he treats each of the facilities as a cost center. Mr. Warner stated he would be glad to share with her any of the spreadsheets showing all of the costs he has separated out. Mr. Warner stated he has asked \$250,000 towards the

Prosecutor's retrofit, it was requested from Cum Cap and County General per the Auditor's suggestion. He is not sure what the status of the request is. Holt and Altman asked to leave it in the budget. Mr. Warner stated if you take out the \$250,000 for the Prosecutor's build-out, his budget is less than 1% increase over what his actual 2003 revised budget.

Behavior Corp: [4:42:30]

Altman stated by statute we are required to levy 1.33 cents on our assessed valuation. Right now, by statute, we have to give that to our community mental health provider. She has been approached by our welfare department and a couple of other agencies who have used an Anderson provider, who has a Noblesville office, and they are very satisfied with the services provided. It would behoove the county to support a system that is being used with that tax levy. She has not received a response from Karen Beaumont if they concur with splitting our funds to service our clients here. She has not received an answer from the courts, as they assign the people to the services. It is a long drawn process to change our mental health care provider, but it is something we need to start to pursue. From what she has heard from the users of Behavior Corp, they have not been responsive. It is now time to start the process to say we are not satisfied with your services and we need to pursue other providers. Holt stated we have discussed this previously.

Humane Society: [4:44:44]

Altman asked what are we doing with the Humane Society's request? How are we presenting that? Holt stated we do not have the information to adequately discuss it today.

Weights & Measures: 4:45:08]

Altman stated we need to ask Council to reconsider a reduction in the Weights & Measures budget. We are losing \$20,500 with not providing Boone County services. With the resignation of Buddy Clark, it can operate effectively with a Director and a trusty from the jail.

Interim Director - Weights & Measures: [4:46:03]

Mr. Howard requested approval and signatures on a letter to Carey Woodward offering him Interim Director of Weights and Measures effective September 1, 2003 at an annual salary of \$35,785.00. Dillinger motioned to approve. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Auditor [4:46:38]

Liability Trust Claim:

Ms. Kim Rauch requested approval of a Liability Trust Claim payable to Hare Chevrolet in the amount of \$458.28 for repair of a Parks Department truck. Dillinger motioned to approve. Holt seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants Certification:

Ms. Rauch requested the signature of the President on the Certification and Acceptance of the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants Program. Altman motioned to approve. Dillinger seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Acceptance of Bonds/Letters of Credit - Drainage Board:

Ms. Rauch requested acceptance of Bonds and Letters of Credit for the Drainage Board. 1) HCDB-2003-00023 - Travelers Casualty and Surety Company of America Bond No. 104050989 for Clarian North Hospital for excavation of the drainage ponds connecting pipes and drainage outlet - \$726,000.00. 2) HCDB-2003-00044 - Madison County Bank Irrevocable Standby Letter of Credit No. 3224 for Wexley Chase monuments and markers - \$2,875.00. 3) HCDB-2003-00045 - Madison County Bank Irrevocable Standby Letter of Credit No. 3225 for Wexley Chase erosion control - \$48,075.00. 4) HCDB-2003-00046 - Madison County Bank Irrevocable Standby Letter of Credit No. 3226 for Wexley Chase storm sewers - \$139,898.00. 5) HCDB-2003-00047 - Gulf Insurance Company Subdivision Bond No. B21879818 for Long Branch Estates, Section 3 storm sewer, subsurface drainage, erosion control and monumentation - \$169,831.00. 6) HCDB-2003-00048- SAFECO Insurance Company of America Subdivision Bond No. 6223330 for The Ridge at Hayden Run Section 1 - storm sewer - \$153,287.57. 7) HCDB-2003-00049 - SAFECO Insurance Company of America Subdivision Bond No. 6223331 for The Ridge at Hayden Run Section 1 erosion control - \$51,256.65. 8) HCDB-2003-00050 - SAFECO Insurance Company of America Subdivision Bond No. 6223332 for The Ridge at Hayden Run Section 1 monuments and markers - \$2,250.00. Altman motioned to approve. Dillinger seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Payroll Claims: [4:47:33]

Ms. Rauch requested approval of the Payroll Claims for the period of July 14-August 2, 2003 to be paid August 15, 2003. Altman motioned to approve. Dillinger seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Vendor Claims:

Ms. Rauch requested approval of the Vendor Claims to be paid August 12, 2003. Altman motioned to approve. Dillinger seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Dillinger motioned to adjourn. Altman seconded. Motion carried unanimously. [4:48:28]

Commissioners Correspondence

Letter to DLGF from Meredith Carter re: Carmel Annexation
Fax from Krieg-Devault re: Airport Special Exception Zoning
Jon Rodgers Fax re: Airport's Growth
4-H Fairgrounds August 2003 Calendar

IDEM Notice of Sanitary Sewer Plans and Specifications:

Warehna's Pond, Section 1 - Cicero
Marilyn Ridge, Section - Noblesville

IDEM Notice of Appeal Rights:

141st Street Sanitary Sewer Diversion - Fishers

IDEM Notice of Sewer Permit:

Avalon - Fishers
Radiant Christian Life Church - Westfield
Centennial, Section 9, Westfield
Marilyn Ridge, Section 1 - Noblesville
Seven Oaks - Fishers
The Intercostal at Geist, Section 2A, 2B & 2C - Fishers

Present

Christine Altman, Commissioner
Steven C. Dillinger, Commissioner
Steven A. Holt, Commissioner
Robin M. Mills, Auditor
Kim Rauch, Administrative Assistant to Auditor
Fred Swift, Administrative Assistant to Commissioners
Michael A. Howard, Attorney
Doug Carter, Sheriff
Brad Davis, Highway Director
Jim Neal, Highway Engineer
Virginia Hughes, Administrative Assistant to Highway Engineer
Patricia Ogden, Highway Public Service Representative
Dave Lucas, Highway Inspector
Robert Chadwell, Highway Inspector
Mark Fisher, Highway Technical Engineer
Christopher Burt, Highway Staff Engineer
Tim Knapp, Highway Right-of-Way Specialist
Joel Thurman, Highway Project Engineer
Matt Knight, Highway Staff Engineer
Mike McBride, Small Structure Staff Engineer
Faraz Hahn, Highway Department
Kathy Howard, Highway Department
Bob Davis, Highway Superintendent
Kathy Griffin, Millersburg Garage
Scott Griffin, Millersburg Garage
Becki Wise, USI
Jeff Hill, The Corradino Group
David Pluckenbaum, The Corradino Group
Jim Gillaspy, The Star
George Piper, Daily Times
Brian Miller, UCEA
Charles Kiphart, Hamilton County Plan Commission
Jerry Larrison, Beam, Longest & Neff
Floyd Burroughs, Floyd Burroughs & Associates
Polly Pearce, Court Administration
Larry Jacobi, Hamilton County Board of Aviation Commissioners
Jerry Nullim, Fishers Fire Department
Bob Thompson, Hamilton County Surveyor

Hamilton County

Auditor

Rick Conner, Noblesville Housing Authority

Troy Halsell, Noblesville Housing Authority

Diana Lamirand, Noblesville Ledger

John R. Hall, US Department of Housing and Urban Development

William Shaw, US Department of Housing and Urban Development

Fritz Poffenberger, US Department of Housing and Urban Development

Jeanne Meggs, US Department of Housing and Urban Development

Bob Hendericks, EMA

Scott Warner, Buildings and Grounds